UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,295	05/17/2005	Aleksander Resman	RG/G-33025A/Lek	9703
	7590 05/21/201 - LUEDEKA, NEELY	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 1871 Knoxville, TN 37901			ARNOLD, ERNST V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/21/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/521,295	RESMAN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
	Air oille	

	ERNST V. ARNOLD	1616				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 13 May 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
 a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar 		in the final rejection, which	chever is later. In			
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.			
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	•	20(-)				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply original.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
NOTICE OF APPEAL						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on 13 May 2010. A brief in date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or an Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS	ny extension thereof (37 CFR 41.3	7(e)), to avoid dismiss	al of the appeal.			
	t mujay ta tha data of filing a byjaf	مطالح مسلم مسلم مسلم				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☑ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for						
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Short (See 27 CER 4.4)		ected claims.				
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> (See 37 CFR 1.1			OTOL 204)			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpilant Amendment (I	310L-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		timal stilled amondman	t cancaling the			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		i be entered and an ex	kpianation of			
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5,7-9,12-18 and 20</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and						
was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a context because the efficient or other evidence filed in a context because the efficient or other evidence follows:						
entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	and was not earlier presented. Se	ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)).			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.		condition for allowand	ce because:			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
	/					
	/Ernst V Arnold/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 1616				

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Independent claim 1 now recites a humidity limitation and a particle size limitation that were not previously presented. Also the particle size is now limited to about 30 microns which changes the scope of the claim. Independent claim 20 now recites 'at least 10% of a second film forming agent' which was not previously presented. These limitations require further search and consideration before a patentability determination can be made. Claim 20 recites "at least 10% of a second film-forming agent". There is no support in the specification as filed for "at least 10% of a second film-forming agent" and therefore this represents a new concept and is new matter. Original claim 15 recites: "the coating contains at least about 10% of a polymer having viscosity of up to about 15 mPas."; but does not provide support for the instant recitation.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: While Applicant's amendments would overcome the 112 first paragraph new matter over the particle size and scope of enablement as well as the 112 second paragraph, however the other 112 first paragraph new matter rejection is maintained. With respect to the capsule, there is not ipsis verbis support for a capsule. A capsule carries with it a certain meaning in the pharmaceutical art. Applicant discloses in [0017] that is is difficult to encapsulate the micronized form. This could mean that the micronized particles are coated with some film forming polymer to encapsulate them. In fact, in claim 20, a film coating is applied over the tablet core which is a form of encapsulation. In other words, the process of encapsulation does not necessarily mean the resulting product is a capsule per se. A capsule in the pharmaceutical arts is an enclosing structure that encloses a dose of medicine such as a hard or soft gelatin capsule. Nowhere in the specification as filed are such 'capsules' disclosed and thus this represents a new concept and is new matter. With respect to the 103 rejection, Applicant has amended the claims with new limitation that require further search and consideration as, for example, the primary reference of Broad does not expressly teach drying to a final humidity of about 2.5%.

Respectfully, the claims will not be entered because they are not in condition for allowance for at least the reasons provided above.